



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

FEBRUARY, 1914

THE DIPLOMATS OF DEMOCRACY

BY THE EDITOR

The law pertaining to the civil service should be honestly and rightly enforced, to the end that merit and ability shall be the standard of appointment and promotion, rather than service rendered to a political party.—From the Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore in 1912.

My warm advocacy and support both of the principle and of the bona-fide practice of civil-service reform is known to the whole country, and there is no danger that the spoils system will creep in with my approval or connivance.—President Wilson to the National Civil Service Reform League, October 22, 1913.

Speaking to the National Civil Service Reform League at its annual convention on December 13th, Dr. Charles W. Eliot, its President, said:

In general, the cabinet officers, with the exception of the Secretary of State, have seemed to intend to conform to the declaration in their party platform and the well-known opinions of the President; but there have appeared some exceptions to this general policy.

Several of the appointments of obscure men to diplomatic posts have seemed to the public to be made in payment of political debts, but the public attributes these appointments, not to the President, but to the Secretary of State.

We shall deal presently with this singular division of

responsibility as fashioned by the venerable President Emeritus of Harvard University, to whom President Wilson proffered the position of Ambassador to the Court of St. James's.

Meanwhile, what are the facts?

THE MINISTERS TO EUROPE

Of the Ministers Plenipotentiary appointed to European courts by President Wilson a majority at least rank easily as the peers, if not indeed the superiors, of their predecessors.

Mr. Lloyd Bryce performed his duties admirably at The Hague, but the selection of Dr. Henry Van Dyke as his successor was recognized universally as ideal, no less because of his pre-eminent fitness than of the indication afforded of Mr. Wilson's determination to be uninfluenced by past personal resentments in filling public offices.

Mr. Henry S. Boutell was appointed Minister to Switzerland by President Taft for no other reason than that he had lost his place in Congress and wished to continue in the service of his country. The appointment of Mr. Pleasant A. Stovall, the distinguished and cultivated editor of the *Savannah Press*, signified a distinct improvement.

The Belgian post was virtually vacant, President Taft having named Mr. Theodore Marburg in the last days of his administration merely to pay a passing compliment. Mr. Brand Whitlock, whose nomination at this writing awaits confirmation by the Senate, possesses high intelligence, unusual knowledge of public questions, and abundant tact. While lacking the quite exceptional distinction of Mr. Marburg, his welcome and success at the Belgian capital can hardly be doubted.

Mr. Jacob Gould Schurman was so eminently qualified for the post at Athens that his successor, Mr. George Fred Williams, is somewhat overshadowed; and yet, despite his political vagaries and financial heresies, Mr. Williams is a scholar and a gentleman. His appointment again serves an excellent purpose in illustrating the President's remarkable facility in forgiving his opponents.

Between Mr. Swenson of Wisconsin and Mr. Schmedeman of Minnesota, the new Minister to Norway, there appears little room for choice.

We are unacquainted with the record or merits of Mr.

Cyrus E. Wood, former Minister to Portugal, but his successor, Colonel Thomas H. Birch, is well known in New Jersey as a gallant and spirited staff officer, who could hardly have failed to absorb a modicum of wisdom while serving as personal aide to the predecessor of Governor Fielder. Although the propriety of making his first official appearance in the uniform of a New Jersey colonel may be questioned by cavilers, the fact that Mr. Birch began somewhat extensive preparations for his diplomatic labors by ordering a quantity of embossed stationery under the misapprehension that the legation at Lisbon is an embassy need not be regarded as prejudicial, in view of his promptness in relieving the Government of the expense incurred through his own inadvertence.

Of all the European Ministers superseded, the only one whose service seemed to call for special consideration was Mr. John B. Jackson, who rose steadily from the position of second secretary at Berlin in 1900 to that of Minister to Rumania in 1911, after having acquitted himself brilliantly in Greece, Bulgaria, Persia, and Cuba. His successor is Mr. Charles J. Vopicka, born in Dolni Hbity and naturalized in Chicago. With this exception, the changes in the ministries of Europe seem to have been warranted by the prevailing custom.

THE OLD AND NEW AMBASSADORS

Can the like be said of the Ambassadorships, the expensive "prizes" within the gift of the President? Invariably, during the past twenty years, Democrats in convention and from the platform have denounced the Republican practice of bestowing these honors upon wealthy individuals in return for substantial campaign contributions. That Mr. Wilson was sincerely desirous of effecting a reform was evidenced immediately upon his inauguration by announcement from the White House of his determination to select "men without wealth, but possessing every other form of qualification." The difficulties attendant upon the putting of this policy into practice, however, became quickly apparent, and, after making a few abortive and in actual effect somewhat unfortunate attempts, the President abandoned the plan and reverted insensibly to the selective methods of his predecessors. The consequence is that, with the single exception of Mr. Walter H. Page, who contrib-

uted only William Bayard Hale and one hundred dollars in cash, all of those appointed are men who at one time or another supplied pecuniary aid to his canvass. In this respect, therefore, there is little room for differentiation between the old enslavement and the new freedom. We advert to it, not by way of criticism, but simply as a matter of fact and as a probably inevitable circumstance. At the very least, Mr. Wilson is entitled to credit, which could not be rightfully accorded to either Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Taft, for making a commendable, though futile, endeavor to establish a higher and more truly American standard.

The relative merits of the Ambassadors chosen may be summarized briefly. Of Mr. Thomas Nelson Page it may be said without hesitation, as of Dr. Van Dyke, that a more creditable appointment could not have been made. As a litterateur of high repute, a student of international affairs, and a cultivated linguist, he fully realizes the excellent traditions which in former years were generally observed. Despite the long and valuable experience of his predecessor, Mr. O'Brien, it must, we think, be conceded that Mr. Page is the better equipped for the services which devolve upon the American representative in the Eternal City.

So much, unhappily, cannot be said of his fellow-Virginian, Mr. Willard, the new Ambassador to Spain, whose sole qualification is his wealth and whose appointment can only be attributed to his generous donations to the cause. As the successor of Mr. Ide, former Chief Justice and Governor-General of the Philippines, who is fully acquainted with the language and customs of Spain, and a gentleman of modest fortune, Mr. Willard appears as a complete reversal of the President's aspiration. The appointments to Rome and Madrid link themselves naturally together, since, oddly enough, Mr. Page was nominated at the earnest solicitation of the Senators from Virginia in return for their promise to secure confirmation of Mr. Willard, whose selection, being personal to the President, seemed likely to invite opposition.

MR. GERARD AND MR. PENFIELD

Although Mr. Gerard was a liberal contributor to the Democratic campaign fund, his appointment may be safely attributed to political exigencies arising from the strength of Mr. O'Gorman in the Senate at a time when his unquali-

fied co-operation was in a large measure requisite to the success of Administration policies. Although less tactful, perhaps, than his predecessor, Mr. Leishman, and lacking the advantage of the latter's long experience and familiarity with the German language, there can be no question of Mr. Gerard's comparative ability or faithfulness to duty. Already, indeed, according to reports from Berlin, he has won for himself a most enviable position not only at the court of the Kaiser, but in the esteem of the government and of the German people.

The most unseemly foreign appointment made by President Taft was that of Mr. Kerens, the Missouri railway contractor, to be Ambassador to Austria. He had paid handsomely and received his reward, in conformity with Republican practice. The like is true of his successor, Mr. Penfield, who eagerly sought and gleefully obtained "recognition" for his "services" in time of need. From the day on which the proceeds of the quinine monopoly were drawn upon to the extent of fifty thousand dollars in aid of Mr. Bryan's canvass in 1908, there was never a question in any informed mind of the underlying cause of enthusiastic endeavor on the part of the Penfield family in the interest of true Democracy. An embassy was the desideratum, and, after the first fruitless gamble, an embassy was achieved in consideration of funds duly provided at critical moments in response to urgent insistence. Nevertheless, it is but fair to note that Mr. Penfield was vice-consul at London and consul-general in Egypt under Mr. Cleveland, and wears various decorative medals which were conferred upon him from time to time by grateful foreign governments and societies concerned with geographical problems. It is a fortuitous circumstance that, if he can shine at all, he will seem positively luminous against the background afforded by the drowsily opulent Mr. Kerens.

Our new Ambassador to Turkey, Mr. Morgenthau, is less fortunate, with respect to contrast, than Mr. Penfield. His immediate predecessor was Mr. Rockhill, whose unique record must be recalled, as follows:

1884-8—Secretary Peking legation.

1887—Chargé d'affaires at Seoul, Korea.

1888-92—Upon scientific expeditions to Tibet.

1892-4—Chief clerk State Department.

1894-5—Third assistant Secretary of State.

1896-7—First assistant Secretary of State.

1897-9—Minister to Greece, Rumania, and Servia.

1899-1905—Director Bureau of American Republics.

1905-09—Minister to China.

1909-11—Ambassador to Russia.

1911-13—Ambassador to Turkey.

Although not yet sixty years old, Mr. Rockhill when superseded had been in the diplomatic service nearly thirty years and had won ten promotions by demonstration of exceptional capacity, without the aid of political influence of any kind. He is, in brief, the precise type of man whose retention the author of *The State*, writing academically, would have advocated with greatest fervor. Mr. Morgenthau is a prosperous New York business man who loaned money to the Democratic campaign committee.

MR. PINDELL OF PEORIA AS A POET

The appointment of Mr. Pindell, of Peoria, to be Ambassador to Russia, instead of internal-revenue collector of the Third District of Illinois, still awaits confirmation by the Senate, whose hesitancy is said to be due less to considerations of fitness than to a curious lack of frankness concerning the reputed designation of postmasters to act as agents for Mr. Pindell's newspaper. We need not recall the peculiar circumstances which induced the making of this grotesque nomination. The most vivid imagining could add nothing to the limpid explanations adduced by the Secretary of State and the ebullient Senator from Illinois. It is interesting to note, however, that the Russians themselves possess exclusive information to the effect that Mr. Pindell is a poet. They derived this impression from Senator Lewis's laudatory letter which was published in full in the *Novoe Vremya* and reprinted in part in the *St. Petersburg Press*. We quote from correspondence from the Russian capital:

If Mr. Pindell is really a poet then his countrymen here owe him apologies, for none of them seem to be able to quote his verse. They were mildly surprised to read a telegram from Washington a few weeks ago saying that the appointment of the poet Pindell to be American Ambassador in St. Petersburg had been confirmed. Even in Russia it is not usual to offer a high public appointment to a poet who seeks "plenty of enjoyment and the social advantages attached to the position (of Ambassador to the Czar's court), especially for his daughter."

While freely admitting that, despite the seeming disrespect to their government implied in the appointment of an

Ambassador upon the terms outlined by Senator Lewis and Mr. Bryan, Mr. Pindell would be received without prejudice, the Russian ministers, nevertheless, "can scarcely believe that he will come here as Ambassador from the United States."

That, of course, is a polite way of saying that, if Mr. Pindell should appear, his credentials would be accepted and he would be ignored. How could it be otherwise? Russia is a great and proud nation, wholly unaccustomed to playing enforced parts in opera-bouffe performances such as this has come to be. She is, moreover, the only one whose helpful friendship has never failed us, and is now frankly desirous of arranging the terms of a new treaty to our satisfaction and mutual advantage. To send Mr. Pindell to St. Petersburg under the conditions imposed by the Administration, authorizing him to accept the hospitality of the Russian nation while withholding from him any real authority to represent our own, simply to do him honor and to please his little daughter, would be a gross impertinence. We find it difficult to believe that President Wilson will permit the consummation of this absurd travesty. We do not presume to guess even at the reasons which induce his insistence upon the nomination; but we do declare plainly that the failure of Mr. Pindell to relieve the President of obvious embarrassment by demanding the withdrawal of his name betrays a deficiency in mental and moral perceptiveness which leaves no doubt of his unfitness to serve as an Ambassador of the United States to another Power of equal rank, dignity, and national sensitiveness.

MR. REID AND MR. PAGE

Mr. Whitelaw Reid was never regarded as a peer of his illustrious predecessors, from Thomas Pinckney to Mr. Joseph H. Choate, and became the object of no little American criticism in consequence of his quite ostentatious mode of living. Nevertheless, he was a publicist of note, had been a candidate for Vice-President and Ambassador to France, was thoroughly versed in diplomatic and social usages, was unremitting in personal service to his countrymen, and maintained his position with the dignity and tactfulness so highly appreciated by the British people. It is no reflection upon the personal character or professional ability of

his successor, Mr. Walter H. Page, to record the simple fact that he is regarded in London as comparatively commonplace, not so much because of his quieter and more becoming manner of living as of his seeming lack of equipment for the performance of his varied and exacting duties. Although for long a competent editor of magazines, Mr. Page's interests and training had been educational rather than political, and necessarily his knowledge of the affairs most directly concerned in his official work was casual rather than profound. It was but natural, therefore, that at the beginning he should, as in fact he did, make an occasional *faux pas*. Nevertheless, signs are manifest that Mr. Page's sterling qualities and willingness to learn are gradually obliterating the effects of his early indiscretions, and it is unlikely that the President will find it necessary to exercise the privilege, which he reserved in a clause of his formal appointment of the Ambassador, of withdrawing him at any time. Indeed, to do so, despite the understanding, except with Mr. Page's full acquiescence, would seem almost ungracious, since the chief difficulty with which the new Ambassador was obliged to contend was of the President's own making.

The British have come to regard the position of American Ambassador to their court as second only to that of the President himself, and, having in mind their own attitude and the marked attentions which they invariably bestow upon him as distinguished from representatives of other Powers, they naturally like to think that Americans, too, hold the post in like esteem. It is easy, then, to see how the gratification which they felt at the original designation of President Eliot gave way to surprise when the offer was rejected, and how surprise yielded to positive chagrin when Mr. Olney, in turn, made known his declination. They could appreciate President Wilson's desire to pay compliments to distinguished friends, but they could not understand why formal proffers should be made without preliminary inquiries respecting acceptance. The slight interest which remained in the President's third choice, too, was largely dissipated by the fact that he was so wholly unknown that for a time he was confounded with the more easily recognized Ambassador to Rome. In a word, Mr. Page suffered at the outset from the feeling of the English that his final appointment implied little, if any, compliment

to either him or themselves. A precisely similar, though less accentuated, situation maintains to-day in France, where those in authority whose favorable regard is most desirable do not hesitate to voice resentment at the American ambassadorship being tossed back and forth like a shuttlecock for a full year between the President and the chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Granting, however, as we must, the hapless infelicity of such proceedings, the fact remains that our present ambassadorial representation abroad, taken as a whole, compares favorably with that which it supplanted—an outcome truly noteworthy in view of the dearth of proven capability in the Democratic party and the very slight acquaintance of the President with members who might possess availability.

POLITICAL DEBAUCHERY IN LATIN AMERICA

We come now to the branch of the diplomatic service whose reformation upon a higher plane, initiated by Secretary Hay, and scrupulously safeguarded by Secretary Root and Secretary Knox, with the full approval of Presidents McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft, reflects the highest credit upon the Republican party—and alas! the scene changes. We refer, of course, to the Latin-American missions, obviously the most delicate and difficult of all in the present state of our relationship to the smaller republics of the Western Hemisphere. It was to the changes in these posts that President Eliot took exception in his report to the Civil Service Reform League. They may be summarized as follows:

Mr. Arthur M. Beaupre was Minister to Cuba. He entered the service in 1897, when he was appointed, after examination, secretary of the legation and consul-general at Guatemala. Subsequently he became secretary of the legation at Bogota, then Minister to Colombia, Minister to Argentina, Minister to the Netherlands, and finally, after fourteen years, Minister to Cuba. His successive promotions were attributed to manifestation of exceptional capacity. His successor is Mr. William E. Gonzales, editor of the *Columbia*, South Carolina, *State*.

Mr. Montgomery Schuyler, Jr., was Minister to Ecuador. He began as second secretary of the legation at St. Petersburg in 1902, and became successively secretary at Bangkok, to the legation in Rumania and Servia, to the embassies

to Tokio and Mexico, and Minister to Ecuador. He is a scholar and a linguist and has never been a partisan. His successor is Mr. Charles S. Hartman of Bozeman, Montana, a free-silver Republican who supported Mr. Bryan in his various campaigns.

Mr. Lewis Einstein was Minister to Costa Rica. Beginning in 1903, he served as third secretary in Paris and in London, second secretary in Constantinople, first secretary in Peking, and as Minister to Costa Rica from July 6, 1911. His successor is Mr. Edward J. Hale, editor of the Fayetteville, North Carolina, *Observer*, who is seventy-four years old.

Mr. William W. Russell was Minister to San Domingo. He had been in the service since 1895, first as secretary at Caracas and at Panama, then as Minister to Colombia, to Venezuela, and finally, from 1910, to San Domingo. His successor is Mr. James M. Sullivan, a New York lawyer who achieved eminence by defending "Bald Jack" Rose in the notorious Becker trial. His cousin is a contractor interested in railway concessions in San Domingo.

Mr. Henry W. Furniss was Minister to Haiti. He is a Harvard graduate who was appointed consul to Bahia, after examination, in 1898, and was promoted to the Haitian mission in 1905. His successor is Mr. Madison R. Smith, a lawyer-editor of Farmington, Missouri, who served one term in Congress.

Mr. H. Percival Dodge was Minister to Panama. Beginning in 1897, he served successively as third, second, and first secretary at Berlin, secretary at Tokio, Minister to Honduras and Salvador, Minister to Morocco, chief of the Division of Latin-American Affairs in the Department, and, since 1911, as Minister to Panama. His successor is Mr. William Jennings Price, a lawyer, of Danville, Kentucky.

Mr. Horace G. Knowles was Minister to Bolivia. Although only fifty years old, he has been consul to Bordeaux and Minister to Rumania, to Bulgaria, to Nicaragua, to San Domingo, and, since 1910, to Bolivia. His successor is Mr. John D. O'Rear, formerly city counsel of Mexico, Missouri.

Mr. James T. DuBois was Minister to Colombia. He had been commercial agent at Aix-la-Chapelle, consul at Callao, consul-general at St. Gall, law clerk of the State Department, and consul-general at Singapore, before being appointed Minister to Colombia in 1911. His successor is Mr.

Thomas T. Austen, a ranch-owner, of Austin, Texas, presumptively not unknown to Assistant-President Edward M. House.

Mr. George T. Weitzel was Minister to Nicaragua. Entering the service, after examination, in 1907, he was appointed successively secretary at Nicaragua and Costa Rica, secretary at Panama, second secretary at Mexico, diplomatic adviser to Admiral Kimball, assistant chief of the Division of Latin-American Affairs, and Minister to Nicaragua. His successor is Mr. Benjamin L. Jefferson, of Steamboat Springs, Colorado, a Bryan elector, otherwise engaged in the practice of medicine.

Mr. Charles D. White was Minister to Honduras. He was graduated from the Universities of Princeton and Berlin and, beginning in 1904, served as secretary at Buenos Aires, to the legation at the Netherlands, at Christiania and Havana before he was appointed Minister to Honduras in 1911. His successor is Mr. John Ewing of the New Orleans *States*, formerly collection teller for a St. Louis bank, and deputy collector of customs at Mobile, Alabama.

Mr. Henry C. Howard was Minister to Peru. He was a judge in Kentucky when appointed two years ago. His successor is Mr. Benton McMillin, the Democratic war-horse of Tennessee, *et al* sixty-eight.

Mr. Robert S. R. Hitt was Minister to Guatemala. He began as third secretary at Paris in 1901 and continued as second secretary at Berlin, first secretary at Rome, first secretary at Berlin, Minister to Panama, Minister to Venezuela, and, from 1910, as Minister to Guatemala. His successor is Rev. William H. Lovell, of Austin, Texas, a Baptist minister aged sixty-three.

The average experience of the former Ministers to these South and Central American republics was fifteen and one-third years, and their average age at the time of their expulsion was forty-seven. All spoke the language of the countries to which they were accredited. The average age of the new Ministers is fifty-four and one-half, five being past sixty; no one of them, we believe, understands Spanish; and none, of course, has had diplomatic experience. In other words, twelve trained and capable representatives, several of whom entered the service under competitive examination and all of whom had long since forsaken partisanship, are superseded by mere party hacks whose ages

clearly disqualify them for continuance in office for sufficient time to equip themselves for proper performance of their duties. A clearer case of partisan political debauchery cannot be imagined.

PRESIDENT WILSON, NOT MR. BRYAN, TO BLAME

President Eliot affixes the blame to Secretary Bryan, whose henchmen, with the possible exception of two neighbors of Assistant-President House in Austin, Texas, comprise the galaxy of incompetents. Another authority upon civil-service reform, a former Vice-President of the League to which Dr. Eliot made his report, disagrees. Writing in *The State*, published in 1898, Woodrow Wilson said:

One of the chief points of interest and importance touching any system of administration is the relation which the ministers of state bear to the Executive. . . . Under our own system the heads of departments are brought together into at least nominal unity by their common subordination to the President. Although they are, as we have seen, rather the colleagues than the servants of the President, his authority is yet always in the last resort final and decisive: the secretaries have had very few powers conferred upon them by Congress in the exercise of which they are not more or less subject to presidential oversight and control. The President is in a very real sense head of the Executive.

Furthermore:

The unfortunate, the demoralizing influences which have been allowed to determine executive appointments since President Jackson's time have affected appointments made subject to the Senate's confirmation hardly less than those made without its co-operation; Senatorial scrutiny has not proved effectual for securing the proper constitution of the public service. Indeed, the "courtesy of the Senate" . . . has frequently threatened to add to *the improper motives of the Executive* the equally improper motives of the Senate.

Again:

The carrying out of those portions of the [Civil Service] Act which relate to the method of choosing public officers is, however, almost entirely subject to the approval of the President. The Constitution vests in him the power of appointment, subject to no limitation except the possible advice and consent of the Senate. Any Act which assumes to prescribe the manner in which the President shall make his choice of public servants must, therefore, be merely advisory. The President may accept its directions or not, as he pleases. *The only force that can hold him to the observance of its principle is the force of public opinion.*

There is no escape from the clear and forceful logic of Mr. Wilson. A President may authorize or request a Secretary of State to submit recommendations, but it is the President himself who makes the appointments and signs the commissions, whose authority is "always in the last resort final and decisive." That Mr. Bryan, apparently abetted for personal reasons by Assistant-President House, has availed himself of the opportunity to discharge peremptorily members of the diplomatic service who had won their places by merit and fidelity and had every moral right to expect that their faithfulness and honest endeavor no less than their developed capacity would be considered, and to put into their places his own personal followers, no one of whom can speak or write any language except his own, is sufficiently obvious. But who accorded him the privilege, if not the President? Moreover, is Dr. Eliot quite fair in impugning the conduct of the Secretary of State? To the best of our information, Mr. Bryan has never espoused the merit system. While not going so far as to declare the right of the victors to the entire spoils, he did not hesitate in 1908 to pledge at least a half to his adherents in the event of success. And only last month his Associate Editor, Mr. Metcalfe, himself a beneficiary, pronounced it "ridiculous to suppose" that President Wilson would not "use the forthcoming canal organization as a means of reciprocating the efforts of those constituents who helped to place him where he is." Surely no charge of false pretense or hypocrisy can lie against Mr. Bryan. He is a true-blue Jacksonian Democrat, avowedly amenable to "the unfortunate, the demoralizing influences which have been allowed to determine executive appointments since President Jackson's time," and has never pretended to be anything else. It was not the Secretary of State who wrote:

"My warm advocacy and support both of the principle and of the bona-fide practice of civil-service reform is known to the whole country, and there is no danger that the spoils system will creep in with my approval or connivance."

It was Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, who also said:

"The President may accept its [the Service Act's] directions or not, as he pleases. The only force that can hold him

to the observance of its principle is the force of public opinion."

Truer words were never spoken; and we suspect that the force alluded to will be exercised and that its effect will be felt. But why does Woodrow Wilson do such things? How *can* he? Can anybody tell?

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. Hearst says in his many newspapers:

The President's message is written with his usual fine literary skill and persuasive charm of eloquence. It makes many sound suggestions, but it is not a programme for trust regulation and is not intended to be.

It is intended to allay alarm, to encourage "big business" by assuring it that "our object is not to unsettle business or anywhere seriously to break its established courses"; by convincing it that "the antagonism between business and Government is over."

In a word, it seems to us that President Wilson is now unduly scared by the dark clouds which he failed to discern at all six weeks ago.

As usual, we disagree. Some of the President's phrasing might pass for eloquence, but the construction is labored and the style tumid. Witness the opening paragraph:

In my report "on the state of the Union" which I had the privilege of reading to you on the second of December last, I ventured to reserve for discussion at a later date the subject of additional legislation regarding the very difficult and intricate matter of trusts and monopolies. The time now seems opportune to turn to that great question; not only because the currency legislation, which absorbed your attention and the attention of the country in December, is now disposed of, but also because opinion seems to be clearing about us with singular rapidity in this other great field of action. In the matter of the currency it cleared suddenly and very happily after the much-debated act was passed; in respect of the monopolies which have multiplied about us and in regard to the various means by which they have been organized and maintained, it seems to be coming to a clear and all but universal agreement in anticipation of our action, as if by way of preparation, making the way easier to see and easier to set out upon with confidence and without confusion of counsel.

If, in 1893 or thereabouts, a student at Princeton had submitted to the Professor of Jurisprudence and Politics and author of *Mere Literature* an essay containing in a single paragraph as many "great"s, "clear"s and "clearing"s, "in respect of"s and "in regard to"s as appear above, he might not have been held up to scorn as "deserving of a very serious reprimand," but he surely would

have gotten off easily with any punishment less severe than that which has come to be known as the Carabaon. Nevertheless, though only an inconstant reader of our most popular daily journals, we can readily comprehend the impression of "persuasive charm" blurred upon Mr. Hearst's literate consciousness by this medley of words.

But it is of substance, rather than of form, that we would speak as candidly as may be. Mr. Hearst hints somewhat brusquely that considerations of political expediency contributed largely to the temperateness of the President's utterance; that, "in a word," he is "now unduly scared by the dark clouds which he failed to discern at all six weeks ago." In all sincerity, after having perused the Message with painstaking vigilance, we gladly confess our inability to descry the slightest basis for this uncomplimentary opinion. Indeed, to our mind, Mr. Wilson appears at his very best in this declaration of purpose. He recognizes fully the pressing need of reassurance with respect to the general attitude of Government toward business; he pledges co-operation and fair consideration in place of pertinacious compulsion; he proclaims a hitherto unsuspected willingness, even a warm desire, to entertain suggestions from any worthy source; he makes no dogmatic and inflexible insistence upon the enactment of a single statute specifically drawn; he maintains complete openness of mind concerning methods and details; *and yet* he deviates not one hair's-breadth from his fixed determination, avowed long ago, to write certain essential requirements into the law of the land. He may, quite likely does, as Mr. Hearst suggests, discern more clouds now than he beheld when taking a mere casual glance at the firmament some weeks ago; but, seeing them, he proceeds forthwith to have at them with vigor, to the end that untoward consequences may not ensue, to the prevention of a full and fair test of the new dispensation. That is what we hoped for. It is shrewd politics, to be sure, as even Mr. Hearst tacitly admits; and why not? Has the Democratic party come into power only to play the traditional fool? But it is more and better than shrewd politics; it is true statesmanship, strong, broad, and wise, and *certain to be effective because it gathers behind it instantaneously the irresistible force of public approval.*

We may be less sanguine than the President that "the antagonism between business and Government is over"

already; we may question whether the two are now fully "ready to meet each other half-way in a common effort to square business methods with both public opinion and the law"; but we do declare unhesitatingly that the moment it shall be clearly demonstrated that the object of Government is in fact "*not* to unsettle business or anywhere seriously to break its established courses athwart," and that what must be done shall be done "in thoughtful moderation, without revolution of any untoward kind," the wretched antagonism which has subsisted so long and so disastrously *will* be over for years to come. Therein lies the hope of the Nation no less than the disgust of the greedy and the dismay of the demagogue.

Clearly the country has accorded a hearty welcome to the President's proposals. It would be sheer waste of time, however, to attempt intelligent discussion until they shall be duly formulated into explicit statutes. May that important task be performed by Mr. Clayton and his associates with the greatest speed consistent with the exercise of utmost carefulness, should be the wish of all good citizens and most particularly of all Democrats, good and bad, who have in mind the possibilities attendant upon the forthcoming Congressional elections.

Meanwhile (if we may be permitted): Sincere compliments to the President upon his courageous repudiation of the pusillanimous rest-cure recommended by his only Vice from the banks of the river Eel!

HETCH HETCHY, AGAIN

THE announced proposal of Senator John D. Works to reopen the Hetch Hetchy case with a view to repealing the national grant of water and power rights to San Francisco should and probably will receive scant consideration from Congress. The President set forth succinctly the reasons for this legislation when he withstood the heavy pressure brought to bear upon him by thousands of well-intentioned but ill-informed persons and courageously approved a practical measure of great benefit to the people, without regard to political considerations. He wrote as follows:

I have signed this bill because it seemed to serve the pressing public needs of the region concerned better than they could be served in any other way, and yet did not impair the usefulness or materially detract from the beauty of the public domain.

The bill was opposed by so many public-spirited men, thoughtful of the interests of the people and of fine conscience in every matter of public concern, that I have naturally sought to scrutinize it very closely. I take the liberty of thinking that their fears and objections were not well founded. I believe the bill to be, on the whole, in the public interest, and I am the less uncertain in that judgment because I find it concurred in by men whose best energies have been devoted to conservation and the safeguarding of the people's interests, and many of whom have, besides, had a long experience in the public service, which has made them circumspect in forming an opinion upon such matters.

He thereby, declared the Chicago *Inter-Ocean*, voicing the judgment of a large section of the newspaper press, "disappointed thousands of his admirers who believed he would have the insight and courage to stop what has openly been called the most stupendous graft that has ever been authorized by any Legislature, state or national." This statement undoubtedly is correct, but the reason why those thousands were disappointed is to be found in the fact that, unlike the President, they had not scrutinized the bill closely enough to be able to pass intelligently upon its merits. A careful perusal of the House reports and the Senate debates upon the subject cannot fail to convince any sensible and fair mind of the wisdom and propriety of his action. It is not, indeed, too much to say that a veto would have involved disregard of official obligation in the interest of personal popularity.

Seldom has a project of such magnitude been so grossly misrepresented. Probably a majority of the people still believe that a great portion of the Yosemite National Park is to be despoiled wantonly for the undue commercial advantage of a single city. The facts are that the Hetch Hetchy Valley is in the Sierra Nevada mountain range, thirty miles north of and wholly separated from the Yosemite; that it is now so nearly inaccessible that less than fifty persons visited it last summer; that of the 719,622 acres comprising the entire park, only 1,330 acres are to be flooded; that of this insignificant portion San Francisco already owns nearly 700 acres; that in exchange for the remainder the city transfers to the national government a larger area of land which it owns within the boundaries of the park; and that the creation of a great lake will not only enhance rather than impair the beauties of the region, but will open up to tourists and campers an enormous territory which is now unavailable for sight-seeing and recreation.

There is no spoliation whatever; only a fair exchange which is "no robbery," in order that the resources provided by Nature may be utilized for the actual and pressing needs of a community which already comprises 750,000 souls and whose growth and development, because of the alternate seasons of drought and plenty in California, are peculiarly dependent upon an adequate supply of pure water. This is true conservation in the view of common sense no less than in the expert judgment of Mr. Gifford Pinchot, who testified as follows:

We come now face to face with the perfectly clear question of what is the best use to which this water that flows out of the Sierras can be put. As we all know, there is no use of water that is higher than the domestic use. Then, if there is, as the engineers tell us, no other source of supply that is anything like so reasonably available as this one, if this is the best and within reasonable limits of cost, the only means of supplying San Francisco with water, we come straight to the question of whether the advantage of leaving this valley in a state of nature is greater than the advantage of using it for the benefit of the city of San Francisco.

Now, the fundamental principle of the whole conservation policy is that of use—to take every part of the land and its resources and put it to that use in which it will best serve the most people—and I think there can be no question at all but that in this case we have an instance in which all weighty considerations demand the passage of the bill. . . . The construction of roads, trails, and telephone systems which will follow the passage of this bill will be a very important help in the park and forest reserve. The national forest telephone system and the roads and trails to which this bill will lead will form an important additional help in fighting fire in the forest reserves. As has already been set forth by the two Secretaries, the presence of these additional means of communication will mean that the national forest and the national park will be visited by very large numbers of people who cannot visit them now. I think that the men who assert that it is better to leave a piece of natural scenery in its natural condition have rather the better of the argument, and I believe that if we had nothing else to consider than the delight of the few men and women who would yearly go into the Hetch Hetchy Valley, then it should be left in its natural condition. But the considerations on the other side of the question, to my mind, are simply overwhelming, and so much so that I have never been able to see that there was any reasonable argument against the use of this water-supply by the city of San Francisco, provided the bill was a reasonable bill.

Or, as Secretary Lane remarked: "I think, as one having charge of the park, that it will be beneficial, and that any one who really knows the country and appreciates the advantages that will come by the opening up of it and making it accessible and putting it to use must indorse this proposition as against some rather doubtful esthetic considerations."

And Secretary Houston, even more pithily: "I think there is a great deal of beauty in San Francisco to be conserved and that the hundreds of thousands of people there have some claims upon the government."

It was to the testimony of men such as these that President Wilson alluded as having influenced his decision to do that which clearly would confer "the greatest good upon the greatest number." The measure having passed the House unanimously and the Senate by a vote of nearly two to one, there is little likelihood that Congress will permit a reopening of the subject, but there is a possibility that the proposal may evoke another storm of criticism from misguided sentimentalists. It is well, therefore, to set down the simple facts in order to make plain to every sane mind, not only that the President could not properly have done otherwise, but that what he did was intrinsically and unescapably right.

HELPING THE ADMINISTRATION

THE latest "rider" in furtherance of reversion to the spoils system is that reported to the House of Representatives by the Post-Office Committee removing twenty-four hundred assistant postmasters from the classified service, to which they were assigned by the executive order of September 30, 1910. It is identical with the proviso exempting deputy collectors which was added to the Urgent Deficiency Bill and received the official sanction of the President. Its recommendation by the Committee, therefore, occasioned no surprise.

But the situation has changed. Elsewhere in this REVIEW we recall the observation of Professor Woodrow Wilson in *The State* to the effect that "the only force that can hold him [the President] to the observance of its [the Civil Service Act's] principle is the force of public opinion." It is now, we are proud and happy to record, the high privilege of President Wilson to confirm in actual practice his own academic observation. Our frank criticism of his action in the previous instance, under the title "Breaking the Pledge," bore upon his failure to make known his position while there was yet time to eliminate the obnoxious proviso from the Bill, believing, as we did, that "by a nod of his head he could have beaten it in the House of Representatives, where a change of only three votes would have

prevented its passage." The newspaper Press generally approved this view and the consequence is that the President announces definitely that he will veto the Post-office Bill if it comes to him encumbered with the "rider" reported by the Committee. This means that the provision will be stricken out and that Mr. Wilson will be relieved of the necessity of filing another exculpatory memorandum.

We frankly regard the happy result of this short but vigorous campaign as a distinct triumph won for and on behalf of the Administration through arousal of that public opinion whose force Professor Wilson so clearly recognized. Now if the President will go but a step further and declare that he will never sign another Bill carrying a provision not germane to the real purport of the measure, joy shall be unconfined.

MR. ZAPATA—PROGRESSIVE CANDIDATE

ALTHOUGH the precise date for a full, fair, and free election of a President of Mexico has not yet been fixed, the primaries are well under way and the candidates are advertising their respective merits after the fashion of their country. The benevolent Mr. Carranza continues to hold his lead among the Constitutionalistas, but the more energetic Mr. Villa is pressing forward with no little vehemence and success. Indeed, the reports seem to indicate that the latter's exceptional pillaging capacity is winning for him wide-spread popularity among the more competent murderers who comprise the dominant faction of his party. It is but natural, under the circumstances, that his benign rival should maintain a discreet absence from the more prosperous assassin's immediate vicinity.

Meanwhile, thanks to the enterprise of the *New York World*, we are enabled to contemplate the physical, mental, and moral characteristics of the Progressive candidate, Mr. Emiliano Zapata, who is making a lively canvass in the state of Morelos, somewhat to the annoyance of the inhabitants, whose lives, wives, children, and properties he is taking at will. The correspondent found Mr. Zapata at Xolox—"the embodiment of sullen, suspicious, defiant, insolent brute force."

Across his lanky legs, which were incased in tightly fitting charro trousers, strapped under dusty tan boots, his red, hairy hands lay loosely.

Three fingers were circled with rings. One finger, from the knuckle to the first joint, was covered with rings, four or five of them bearing huge diamonds and a ruby and an emerald. Bigger diamonds were on the other fingers. The jewels fairly shrieked "loot" at one. So did the gold watch that was strapped around his wrist. Every man in his entourage was similarly decked out with gaudy but valuable jewelry. Over a soiled, rumpled blue silk shirt Zapata wore a short charro jacket. Embroidery in gold bullion almost hid the fabric of which the jacket was made. The buttons were of gold.

So were a double row of buttons on the outside of his tight trousers, as well as tiny chains that connected up the buttons two by two. Knotted under a low collar that sadly needed laundering was a red silk tie with long ends that flared down to the waist. In the tie was another diamond as big as the butt of one of the .30-30 Mauser cartridges which he bore in his belt and as yellow as the white of a bilious man's eye. Two automatic revolvers resembling young cannon snuggled in stamped leather holsters at his hips. In gold, on each holster, were monogrammed his initials. Gold damascened silver spurs jangled from the heels of his boots. By his side lay a huge sombrero with pounds and pounds of gold bullion on the brim and crown. Here, again, on either side of the crown, shone a gold monogram. Any pawnbroker in Mexico would have loaned Zapata at least twenty thousand pesos on himself as he sat taking his ease before the fire in Xolox.

Whenever Zapata spoke to the men or gave an order he fairly barked the words at them in a rough, guttural voice. Instant compliance was always given, and a semi-military salute invariably prefaced any speech that Zapata's men addressed to him.

Impressions of brutality, ruthlessness, cunning, but nothing of real cleverness; an ill-proportioned ambition, vanity, and other qualities akin to these, forced themselves upon one as the rebel leader's dominant characteristics. He is as impressive as a gaunt, fiery-eyed, snarling tiger-man who has committed some monstrous crime, or as a repulsive serpent is impressive, not because of anything within them latently noble, beneficent, or useful, but by reason of malign power for harm which they hold.

One cannot train the imagination sufficiently to divine a humane, kind, wise, or patriotic Zapata. His appearance and manner, everything that one turns to the world in converse with other men, is against him. Revelations of self which came during the interview stamped him as a man, in intellect, education, aspirations, and knowledge of his own country or of other lands, not superior to the average peon whom one encounters anywhere in Mexico during a day's journey.

Mr. Zapata expounded his policies with pitiless publicity. "I am fighting for the people against the aristocrats. I want to get back their land for them. They have been robbed a long time. You Americans have robbed them. All foreigners have robbed them. I have taken care of all the thieving Gatchupinas (Mexican nickname for Spaniards) in Morelos. I have killed them all, excepting those

that ran away and have taken their property. They deserved to die because they stole from the poor. When I become President I shall pass laws to keep foreigners out of the country. They come in and take everything that belongs to Mexicans—mines, lands, oil, everything. Diaz let them do it. He ruined the country by letting foreigners come and build railroads. We do not need railroads in Mexico. If there were none Americans would not come here. Only a few of them came before there were railroads, because it was too long a journey.”

Mr. Zapata also says that Huerta must go, not, however, because he may have done wrong, but because he is a reactionary and will do nothing for the poor—a policy which conflicts with the Progressive candidate’s conception of social justice.

“Yes, it is true,” he declared, “that I sent out a proclamation before Christmas to warn every one in the National Palace that I was coming to kill them. Huerta and every one who is with him I shall hang. I shall not shoot them, for they do not deserve soldiers’ deaths, for they are traitors and thieves.”

Mr. Zapata had stolen and killed, of course; but “I stole only to pay and feed my men, and I killed only those who were oppressors of the poor.” Would he recognize Carranza? He laughed.

“I will tell you about that, for it also is funny,” was his response. “I have no allies, for Zapata fights alone. Why should I ally myself with any one?”

“Carranza sent to me to fight for him. He was very generous. When he became President, he said, he would make me Governor of Morelos. I thought, ‘When I become President I shall make you Governor of Chihuahua.’ Why should he, who has been fighting less than a year, be President instead of me? Would that be fair? But he offered to send me rifles, cartridges, and some cannon. I consented. He did send rifles and cartridges, but no cannon.

“Carranza wanted me to capture Mexico City. I could do it, but why should I turn it over to him? When I take Mexico City I shall keep it for myself, not give it away to a man who cannot win his own battles. I could have captured the city many times, but I am not ready. For a long time my men were afraid. They are poor Indians, used only to the country. They were fearful of a big city like Mexico. Foolish stories had been told them of things that happened there, so they were all frightened. But they will soon forget that. They know I shall do as I promised—capture the city and hang Huerta and all his Ministers unless they run away too fast. No, I am fighting for my own cause, which is the cause of the common people. If others want to join me they may do so. Do I not deserve to

be the leader and have the people elect me President? What other man has fought as successfully as I?

"Tell Huerta that he can never find me, but that if he lingers too long in the place which he has usurped and my people find him, it will not be a happy day. Say to him anything that you wish; what do I care how many soldiers he sends? Nor do I care how much they may fight in Mexico. The harder and longer they fight the easier it will be for me to triumph when I am ready."

American intervention would not dismay Mr. Zapata, he said. Irreconcilable hostility to foreigners is a fundamental provision in his creed.

"Do you not remember," he asked, "that a long time ago the Americans tried to conquer Mexico? They did, for I have heard old people tell of it. They came in great swarms. By treachery they got into Mexico City, but there they met disaster. The Mexicans drove them out of the country—killed thousands of them. They never have dared to make war on us since, for they remembered the lesson they got so long ago. If Americans should return again, I should fight them. I should not join with Huerta, but I would fight them alone. After I had beaten them the country would be mine, for the people would know that it was I who saved Mexico from the Americans and would reward me by making me President. It would please me to see them come."

In other words, Mr. Zapata will co-operate with the United States only in refusing, under any circumstances, to recognize the *de facto* President. As a Mexican gentleman, however, when he gets him, he "will drink a bottle of cognac with him and then kill him."

Clearly, although we may not view his methods of procedure with unqualified approval, Mr. Zapata may prove to be a most serviceable ally in furtherance of our policy of watching and waiting until something happens—to Huerta.

ALL'S WELL WITH CARABAO

It is not yet quite clear whose feelings were most sorely hurt by the Carabao songs—Mr. Bryan's, Mr. Wilson's, or Uncle Sam's. The officers were accounted by the Commander-in-Chief "deserving of a very serious reprimand" because their dinner programme "violated some of the most dignified and sacred traditions of the Service." It is

quite inconceivable that the President meant this to apply to a lively college graduate who acquired fame as a writer of limericks. Nor can it well refer to the Secretary of State, who has become somewhat of a habit, we admit, but has hardly as yet assumed the proportions of a sacred tradition. No, this preliminary allusion must have been to Uncle Samuel himself, upon the theory that he wishes the insurrectos to be blessed instead of damned.

"What," continues the President, "are we to think of officers of the Army and Navy of the United States who think it 'fun' to bring their official superiors into ridicule and the policies of the government which they are sworn to serve with unquestioning loyalty into contempt?" Oh come, now, what "policy" did they bring into contempt? The Mexican, perchance? How could they, when nobody knows what it is? And what "official superior" did they ridicule? Neither Secretary Garrison nor Josephus. They got off scot free of mention. And not Mr. Bryan, who is only the moral, not the official, superior of the army and the navy—a fact delicately implied in the following verse:

Now if Wilson were here to-night,
He would give us a spiel that's right,
On "How to Preserve the Army's Good Name,"
"How to Play the Mexican Game."
But we'd ask him a thing or two,
Policy that we should pursue;
If he'd found it hard replyin',
He'd ask William Jennings Bryan,
Who would sing him "Lead, Kindly Light."

There is nothing really sacrilegious in that. After all, the great Cardinal's beautiful hymn was of human origin, and, what is more, Mr. Bryan does sing something very like it every time he makes a speech and turns his dogged eyes toward the White House. As for the famous battle-ship, is "U.S.S. Piffle" a whit more jocular than "U.S.S. Friendship" or "Fraternity," or whatever it was that the Secretary christened that craft down at Annapolis?

What do we think of medal-wearing officers who thus indulge in "silly effervescences of childish wit" after a care-free dinner? Why, we think mighty well of them, mighty well, and so does everybody, including the President, who would no sooner think seriously of questioning their "loyalty" than of doubting his own. But, as Kip-

ling truly says, when a man's nerves are on edge, 'e's apt to be a bit 'asty an' peevish-like, thus revealing, sometimes by way of joyful surprise, symptoms appealingly human. However, all's well since those sunny days at Pass Presbyterian with jovial John Lind—

So let us sing, Long live the King!
And Bryan, long live he!
And when they mount high horse again,
May none be there to see!

THE EPISODE AT BALANGIGA

By the way, did ever you hear of the episode at Balangiga? No? Nor had we until the other evening, when an officer of the United States army who served in the Philippines told us the story in simple words like these:

Well, it was typical. The island of Samar was at peace. The Gugus had been whipped into order, and they had promised to be good. Company C of the Ninth Infantry was sent to garrison Balangiga. Mind you, there had been peace for a year, and the company was simply to stay there and preserve order. Captain Connell, in command, was a New York boy who had been graduated from West Point, and Lieutenant Bumpus, of Boston, was his junior. There was no other lieutenant with the company, and they mustered some sixty or seventy men, all told.

Connell was a fine, friendly fellow. He was on excellent terms with the padre of the parish and the presidente of the village, not only for official reasons, but because he was a neighborly, amiable sort of man. Nothing could be pleasanter than the relations of Connell and his men with the people of Balangiga. The presidente had undertaken to have the brush cleared away from the neighborhood of the company's quarters, but he called on Captain Connell one evening to apologize for delay because he hadn't enough men for the job. He needed one hundred more.

"Do the best you can," Connell said. "Get all the men you want who will work."

That was all the presidente wanted, and he brought in a few hundred Gugus armed with bolos—long, heavy knives something like machetes, but worse.

Company C was at breakfast next morning when the presidente called on his friend, Captain Connell. Ten naked Gugus slipped up-stairs after him, barefoot all—making no more noise than spiders. Connell, Bumpus, and the doctor were at the table when the presidente stood at the door, smiling.

"Come in, Señor Presidente," said Connell, cheerily, "and have some breakfast!"

He came in, still smiling. His barefooted Gugus leaped in after him

with their bolos ready, and snicked off the heads of Connell and Bumpus and the doctor before they knew what was happening.

The presidente went to the window and threw out the heads. That was the signal. Three or four hundred Gugus—God knows how many—were waiting in the bush and watching the windows. When the heads flew out they swarmed into the mess-hall, bolos flying.

Company C lost half a dozen men in half a dozen seconds; then they got on the job. All they had to work with was the heavy crockery from the table, the stools they sat on, and a few baseball bats that happened to be lying in a corner. Yes, that's all they had—that and their fists—but they held the bolo men and began to drive them back. There was one sergeant, a very handy fellow—queer I can't recall his name at the moment. Well, he got nine with his baseball bat—oh yes, finished 'em all with one tap each.

Yes, sir, those boys held together, and with their thick bowls and plates and bats fought across the plaza to their quarters, and got their rifles and cartridge-belts. Then the Gugus fell back into the bush, but kept up the fight with their guns. What was left of Company C started for a post three miles down the river. They didn't bother about their officers because they had seen the heads in the plaza. There were only thirty men left when they got down to the river-bank and found some boats, but just then the drummer—I think it was the drummer—said:

“Hey, fellows, we forgot the flag!”

So with that they all started back for the plaza, and there they found the flag still flying. You understand, of course, the little brown brothers were firing on them all the time from the bush, and they were firing back. Well, they got the flag, properly lowered and caught and folded, and made for the river again.

There were only twelve men left when Company C got down to the bank, but they had the flag. The twelve got into three or four boats, and started for the fort, three miles away. The river was about as wide as Broadway most of the distance, perhaps twice as wide in some parts. The little brown brothers were firing from the bush on both sides, and our fellows were firing and paddling as best they could.

Only one boat got down to the fort. In it there were three men—and the flag, of course. Only one man was able to move. Some fight, wasn't it?

But that isn't the point. When our people got to Balangiga and saw those poor heads that had been kicked about until they were all tatters and rags and the bodies hacked and mutilated so you can't talk of it, they received impressions that will last as long as they live. That is the sort of thing that has happened over and over again, and, make no mistake, the officers and men who have come in contact with it will always “damn the insurrectos”—as I do now in my heart.

One of the regulars at the fort who received the pitiful remnant of Company C—and the flag—was the officer who recounted the incident, a Carabaon naturally, and among those duly reprimanded in time of peace, petulance, and piffle.

“ UNITED WE STAND ”

WHEN President-elect Wilson discreetly decided, after due deliberation, to take Brother Bryan to his bosom instead of leaving him on his back, our mind was jostled somewhat by the reflection that faithful performance of the duties of Secretary of State might encroach upon the time required by the distinguished editor for brilliant professional performances. Happily our fears have been dispelled. True, the teeming *Commoner* now appears but once a month instead of hebdomadally, as in the good old days, but of this we make no complaint. As a matter of fact,—but never mind about that.

The point is that our Brother-Secretary (he was Brother first) has demonstrated that one really can ride two horses at the same time and maintain what he used to call, when speaking of certain metals, a “ perfect parity ” between the two. Upon this point, of course, opinions may differ. The majority, we suspect, would hold that, in consequence of the disparity in his experiences, Mr. Bryan appears the more luminously in the hall of fame as a thoroughly self-trained journalist, but only the other day no less an authority than Josephus himself pronounced him the greatest Secretary of State since Jefferson, outshining even Marshall, Madison, Monroe, Adams, Clay, Webster, Calhoun, Marcy, Seward, and others literally too numerous to mention. Our own most judicial view has already been indicated. Mr. Bryan seems to us quite as great, but no greater, as Secretary of State as he appears as Editor of the first drum of Democracy. Wherever you put him, he weighs the same.

But we were speaking of the highly serviceable team-work which our Brother-Secretary has inaugurated in his dual capacity to the mutual advantage of the higher journalism and of this feverishly efficient Administration. Aroused by a certain reminder of forthcoming Congressional elections which appeared in the January number of this REVIEW, the *Commoner* announces that it “ has started a movement ” by making a special campaign rate of sixty cents in clubs of five or more, “ which is as near cost as it can be safely estimated.” The language probably is that of Brother Chas., but the source of the inspiration is beyond question. Two pledges are printed with blank spaces for signatures. The first reads as follows:

A PLEDGE

TO ELECT A DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS IN 1914

Publisher *Commoner*: Believing that the way to indorse President Wilson's administration is to elect a Democratic Congress in 1914, and believing that *The Commoner* placed in the hands of worthy Democrats and the independent voters will materially assist in the election of a Democratic Congress as an approval of the administration of President Wilson, I request that you send me the subscription cards indicated below, and I pledge myself to use my utmost endeavor to sell the cards and will remit for them at the Congressional Campaign Special Rate of 60 cents each.

The second pledge is more explicit, *viz.*:

A PLEDGE

Publisher *Commoner*: Desiring to assist in upholding the hands of President Wilson's Administration, and believing that circulating *The Commoner* as current campaign literature in close Congressional districts will materially aid in bringing about the election of the Democratic candidates, I hereby agree to contribute the amount indicated below, the same to be used in sending *The Commoner* at the special rate of 60c per year to persons in my county or district or in another state or district, as I may designate later.

| | | |
|----------------|--|--|
| \$1.00 | | Name |
| \$3.00 | | Box or St. No..... |
| \$5.00 | | P. O.....State..... |
| \$10.00 | | Indicate the amount you are willing to contribute by marking X opposite the figure printed on the end of this blank. |
| \$25.00 | | |

The amount pledged above may be sent in with the pledge, or it may be paid any time within 60 days. This pledge is not negotiable, and collection of it will not be forced. Kindly fill in the pledge and mail at once to *The Commoner*, Lincoln, Neb.

We prefer this one as the more direct and appealing. We also value the prudence manifested by the firm declaration that "this pledge is not negotiable," thus effectually dis-

posing of any danger of a conflict with the new Currency Act through the possible circulation of these pledges as "lawful money." The announcement, too, that "collection will not be forced" is reassuring to a degree. Perhaps it might be well to substitute "R. F. D. . . ." for "Box or St. No. . . .," but this probably would be understood.

But one further suggestion, which frankly we consider a most happy one, is to include THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW and thus unite the two greatest forces now busily engaged in "upholding the hands" aforesaid. We stand ready to join the movement at a moment's notice upon one condition, namely, that the pledge shall read in plain English:

Publishers *Commoner* and NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW: Desiring to uphold the hands of President Wilson's Administration, and believing that this can be done most effectively by obtaining subscriptions for the *Commoner* and the REVIEW, I hereby agree "to contribute," etc.

If Brother-Secretary Bryan will indicate his acceptance of this slight amendment, we will communicate with Brother Chas. respecting a joint rate by the first parcels' post, simultaneously proposing that we print in large black type at the top of the Offer "United We Stand" and stop there, leaving to the imagination of the reader all speculation as to what might happen if by any untoward circumstance we should ever be divided.

We await a prompt and statesmanlike response without impatience.

CONSISTENCY IN JOURNALISM

WE have received from the editor of one of the foremost newspapers of the country a communication from which we quote the following:

. . . But it is not of these specific acts of Mr. Wilson that I wish to write. I do not, in fact could not successfully, deny the justice of your criticisms. What distresses me is that you should feel obliged to make them at all or at least so poignantly. In all friendliness, I ask you if your attitude is quite consistent? I have a right to ask that question. As you know, the — was among the first to take up your suggestion of the President of Princeton for President of the United States and, as you know further, I did so in opposition to my own judgment of its practicability and solely in response to the arguments which you advanced personally when we met at Mr. —'s at dinner away back in 1907. Or was it

1906? But having once enlisted for the war for better government and higher ideals, the — has never wavered. We sounded Mr. Wilson's praises persistently during all those years when hope of success was less than faint. I don't know how many columns of your own pleas in his behalf in the *Weekly* and *REVIEW* we reprinted. Naturally I rejoiced tremendously when the nomination was finally won. We worked hard for his election and are now supporting his administration zealously and hopefully.

This consistent record of what I consider true public service is my chiefest pride as an American journalist. The fact that you initiated and inspired it constitutes my claim of right now, not perhaps to pass rebuke upon your present course, but to beg that you will not persist in it, except after the most thoughtful consideration. Is not your perspective temporarily at fault? You cannot expect to find perfection in any man, though you did pretty nearly convince many of us to the contrary. And again I inquire, Are you consistent? In view of the signal, really marvelous, triumph of your great idea and of the big and broad aspect of affairs, would it not be wiser and more advantageous to the country, regardless of the effect on Mr. Wilson's personal political fortunes, to minimize the minor defects in his Administration? And are you not stultifying yourself somewhat, or at least discrediting your own judgment voiced so earnestly during the long, lean years when we were all being scoffed at for chasing a will-o'-the-wisp? I followed your lead from the beginning, to the greatest satisfaction of my life, and I want to follow it to the end. Won't you let me?

Such a letter from such a source clearly demands an equally candid and, in view of the receipt of like remarks from more casual readers, perhaps public response. It happens that we made it nearly a year ago. If our esteemed friend will turn to *Harper's Weekly* of March 8th, 1913—Inauguration week—he will find the following declaration of purpose:

The period of advocacy now finds a natural and proper ending. A President of the United States stands upon the highest pedestal in the world, far above the plane of possible competition. He wants no exploitation; his every act is noted. He seeks no defense; his deeds make answer to accusation. He needs no interpretation; his faintest whisper carries farther than the combined appeal of hundreds. He requires no spokesman; his own is the voice of the people. For them he stands as their chosen tribune, immune to unjust criticism, sure of deserved rewards; necessarily alone, but serene in his solitude and consciousness of right.

No argument is needed to show that indiscriminating praise would not only be an unkindness to a President of the United States, but would come unworthily from a public journal.

"The press," said Mr. Curtis, "is never a more beneficent power than when it shows the country that, while loyal to a party and its policy, it is more loyal to honor and patriotism. It is the palladium of liberty because it is the only power in a free country that can alone withstand and overthrow the crafty conspiracy of political demagogues. If it does not lead,

it is because it chooses to follow; it is because it does not know that no office is so great as that of molding opinion which makes parties and Presidents; that no patronage is so powerful as the just fear of an unquailing criticism brought home to every word and every act of every public man, and commending its judgment to the intelligence and the conscience of every citizen."

Harper's Weekly reaffirms the principles of its great editor. It regrets nothing that it has done; it rejoices in the re-establishment in power of the party which should and can be great, liberal, and truly democratic; it feels that it has peculiar reason to wish for the administration of President Wilson the greatest conceivable measure of success.

To that end and in that hope, as a natural sequence of the result accomplished, it now resumes the exercise of its normal and highest functions as an independent Journal of Civilization, free and glad to commend generously all that it deems praiseworthy, and equally free and ready to criticize frankly or condemn unsparingly whatever it may adjudge deserving of censure.

From this day forward the attitude of *Harper's Weekly* toward the administration of President Wilson will differ in no respect from its attitude toward the administrations of his predecessors.

No holder of public office can be as big as his party; no party as great as the nation; no group of politicians as potent for good or ill as a fearless and independent press.

No words at our command could make the present position of this REVIEW more clear. Is it not, we ask our friend in turn, wholly consistent, entirely sound, and absolutely right? And have we varied so much as a hair's-breadth from the policy thus defined? True it is and beyond dispute that we do not and shall not "minimize" defects; neither do we nor shall we magnify them. Our sole endeavor, in treating as a public journal of public affairs, is to speak the exact truth and draw exact conclusions. More need hardly be said at this time except perhaps, as our observant friend may have inferred, that we regard cant, hypocrisy, and humbug with distinct disfavor.

COMMENT

It is an amusing anecdote related by the *Tribune*:

Mark Twain brought out *Joan of Arc* anonymously. The book was one of his failures, but he was proud of it. Before he acknowledged its authorship he sometimes fished for compliments about it. One evening at dinner Mark Twain said carelessly to a Senator: "Are you a novel-reader?" "Yes, a great novel-reader," was the reply. "I don't suppose you're following that anonymous new serial, 'Joan of Arc'?" "Indeed I am, through every instalment." "What do you think of it? Is it good?"

"That's hardly a fair question to ask me," the Senator replied. "You see, I wrote 'Joan of Arc' myself."

But we doubt its authenticity. The story appeared in *Harper's Magazine* in 1895, and Mr. Beveridge was not elected to the Senate until 1899.

The most convincing evidence of Mr. John Skelton Williams's fitness to be Comptroller lies in the fact that so competent a judge as Senator Weeks could find no fault in him. Apparently there was no need to raise the abrayed bugaboo of "Wall Street opposition," to secure his confirmation.

"The President does not approve this section of the bill," said Chairman Moon in his speech on the Post-Office "rider." "But this committee is not here to bow to the will of the President or to bow to the will of the present Postmaster-General." Quite true unless, of course, their will happens, as in this instance, to coincide with the will of the country.

You have to give the Hon. John Lind credit for keeping his mouth shut. He is one man who doesn't run down the reporters to get his name in the papers.—*Raleigh News and Observer*, *Josephus*, *Editor*.

Praise from Sir Hubert!

Products of the farm are bringing better prices, and we may look to see increased interest in the raising of cattle, sheep, and hogs.—*Josephus*.

Thus reducing the cost of living.

Reports concerning Mr. Asquith's troubles with his First Lord and Chancellor of the Exchequer revive rumors of growing dissensions among members of a Cabinet somewhat nearer home.

Colonel Harvey proposes Colonel Bryan for President of Mexico, which suggests that the silly season is in ahead of time.—*Rochester Herald*.

He thinks we meant it.